



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

| APPLICATION NO.                | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.  | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| 10/726,202                     | 12/01/2003  | Richard M. Batch     | 61616                | 3293             |
| 24201                          | 7590        | 03/18/2008           | EXAMINER             |                  |
| FULWIDER PATTON LLP            |             |                      | HOPKINS, CHRISTINE D |                  |
| HOWARD HUGHES CENTER           |             |                      |                      |                  |
| 6060 CENTER DRIVE, TENTH FLOOR |             |                      | ART UNIT             | PAPER NUMBER     |
| LOS ANGELES, CA 90045          |             |                      | 3735                 |                  |
|                                |             |                      | MAIL DATE            | DELIVERY MODE    |
|                                |             |                      | 03/18/2008           | PAPER            |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|   |                        |                     |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|
| <b>Advisory Action<br/>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |
|   | 10/726,202             | BATCH, RICHARD M.   |
|   | <b>Examiner</b>        | <b>Art Unit</b>     |
|   | CHRISTINE D. HOPKINS   | 3735                |

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 14 February 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
  - b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
  - (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): See Continuation Sheet.
6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-6,8-17 and 19-23.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/Charles A. Marmor, II/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3735

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Regarding claims 1-11, Applicant contends that the specification is enabling for a processor configured to automatically supply the medical administration device with a treatment guideline. This argument is found persuasive, and thus the rejection of claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, is withdrawn.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding claims 1 and 11, Applicant contends that Bocionek fails to show the supplying of medical devices with revised treatment guidelines and further goes on to add that the examiner has more broadly interpreted the term 'instruction' to be that of 'guideline.' However, this argument is not persuasive. The first point is that no special technical definition is provided within the specification for "guideline." Thus, the broadest reasonable definition has been given, in accordance with that of any guide of a future course of action. Decision functions, 15 and 17, determine optimal drug dosage to be applied as previously noted at [0027]. Bocionek also indicates the functions act to generate prompts, medication selection guidance, and warnings through alert and guidance display elements [0022], thus forming a "guideline." Regarding claim 23, Applicant contends that the medication device does not have an alarm or a library of appropriate parameters. However, this argument is not persuasive. Specifically at [0026], Bocionek states that alarm function 29 generates an alarm based on individual, composite, or weighted composite vital signs from units 81-87 ("medication device"). In view of the foregoing, the rejection of claims 1-6, 8-17 and 19-23 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) citing Bocionek is maintained.